



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,014	07/03/2003	Richard A. Earl	102258.156US1	5448
25270	7590	06/17/2005	EXAMINER	
EDWARD D GRIEFF HALE & DORR LLP 1455 PENNSYLVANIA AVE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004			SACKY, EBENEZER O	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1626	

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/612,014

Applicant(s)

EARL ET AL.

Examiner

EBENEZER SACKKEY

Art Unit

1626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-54 and 56-58 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 55 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

Claims 1-58 are pending.

This is a response to the office action mailed on 12/30/04.

The Petition from Restriction filed under 37 CFR 1.144 on 03/30/05 is acknowledged.

The Petition has been forwarded to the Special Programs Examiner for review and consideration. Decision on the Petition will be forwarded to applicants upon review.

Response to Restriction

Applicant's election of Group X in the reply filed on 03/30/05 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Response to Remarks

Applicant's arguments filed 03/30/05 have been fully considered but they are not deemed persuasive. Applicants argue that claims 1-4 are fully enabled and one of ordinary skill in the art could make and use the invention without undue experimentation, citing MPEP 2164.01(b) and 2164.04. In response, even though 57 working examples are disclosed in the specification, again; only 4 examples pertain to the elected subject matter. Thus, the homogeneity of the 4 examples would provide no insight into structure-activity trends that need to be evaluated. According to MPEP § 2106.02, "it must be emphasized that arguments of counsel alone cannot take the place

of evidence in the record once an examiner has advanced a reasonable basis for questioning the disclosure. See *In re Budnick*, 537 F.2d at 538, 190 USPQ at 424; *In re Schulze*, 346 F.2d 600, 145 USPQ 716 (CCPA 1965); *In re Cole*, 326 F.2d 769, 140 USPQ 230 (CCPA 1964). For example, in a case where the record consisted substantially of arguments and opinions of applicant's attorney, the court indicated that factual affidavits could have provided important evidence on the issue of enablement. See *In re Knowlton*, 500 F.2d at 572, 183 USPQ at 37; *In re Wiseman*, 596 F.2d 1019, 201 USPQ 658 (CCPA 1979)."

Applicants next argue that the instant application is directed to the composition, Kits and methods of use of novel nitrosated nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and dose not involving receptor binding of the compounds of the invention. Contrary to applicant's assertion, NSAID's are known to inhibit the activity of for example cyclooxygenase, see page 6, lines 16-20, page 8, lines 19-31 etc. Thus, it involves receptor binding and considering the thousands, if not millions of compounds to be made, this constitute a large quantity of experimentation. As previously stated, only 4 compounds pertains to the elected subject matter. There is no reasonable basis for the assumption that the myriad of compounds embraced by formula (I) will all share the same biological properties. When considering the factors relating to a determination of non-enablement, if all the other factors point toward enablement, then the absence of working examples will not by itself render the invention non-enabled. In other words, lack of working examples or lack of evidence that the claimed invention works as described should not be the sole reason for rejecting the claimed invention on the

Art Unit: 1626

grounds of lack of enablement. A single working example in the specification for a claimed invention is enough to preclude a rejection which states that nothing is enabled since at least that embodiment would be enabled. Note however, that a rejection stating that enablement is limited to a particular scope may be appropriate. See *In re Harwood*, 156 USPQ 673 in which the court upheld a rejection made for lack of utility, not enablement, in the unpredictable area of insect control, the court holding evidence regarding two species of insects did not support claims for insects generally. Thus, for the reasons of record, the rejection of claims 1-4 is being maintained.

The rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, based on the numerous registry numbers has been withdrawn. However, the rejection of claim 4 is being maintained because it is not clear if applicants are claiming 1 or 2 or 3 nitrosated compounds. As previously pointed out, claim 1 permits one or more ONO_2 groups within X choices.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re*

Art Unit: 1626

Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to E. Sackey whose telephone number is (571) 272-0704.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 am to 4:30 pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph K. McKane, can be reached on (571) 272-0699. The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is

(571) 272-1600.

EOS

June 11, 2005



TAOFIQ SOLOLA

PRIMARY EXAMINER

Dr. T. Solola

Primary Patent Examiner

Art Unit 1626, Group 1600

Technology Center 1